**DOCUMENT RESUME**

ED 150 103 SP 011 772


AUTHOR Reed, Horace B.; Rindone, Douglas

TITLE Inservice Program Implementation of School of Education Guidelines, 1975-6 Enrollees.

INSTITUTION Massachusetts Univ., Amherst. School of Education.


PUB DATE 76
NOTE 27p.

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.83 HC-$2.06 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Facility Guidelines; *Inservice Teacher Education; *Participant Satisfaction; Program Development; *Program Evaluation
IDENTIFIERS *University of Massachusetts Amherst



ABSTRACT

This is a report of a Teacher Education Council (TEC), School of Education, University of Massachusetts study of 21 inservice programs, and 310 participants, currently enrolled for 1975-76. The research is designed to gain information from inservice enrollees on how well the programs are implementing the TEC inservice guidelines. A 32-item questionnaire provides data concerning each of several guidelines and several demographic issues. The response sample was 33 percent, with a total of 101 returns. Responses from programs varied widely, from 11 percent to 100 percent. Several of the programs had a very small total enrollment. For the total sample, participants generally rate programs quite highly on guideline items. There were a number of items that had many responses in the "don't know/doesn't apply" category. A program comparison analysis of 12 programs (selected for size of responses) indicated marked differences among programs in the number of guideline items rated high or low. The small "n" for several programs requires caution in interpretation of this data. Demographic data indicate a large number of inservice enrollees are working for degrees beyond the master's. Their employment status is rather broadly spread across school roles. Motivations for involvement in inservice programs are largely in "professional," "enlarging work dimension," and "degree seeking" categories, as well as "salary increases." Detailed information on all questionnaire items, for the total sample, and for the 12 programs, is available in the full report. Implications and recommendations are also presented. (Author)



**********
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
**********

ED150103

# INSERVICE PROGRAM IMPLEMENTATION OF SCHOOL OF EDUCATION GUIDELINES, 1975-6 ENROLLEES

By

Horace B. Reed

and

Douglas Rindone

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
Horace B. Reed

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC) AND THE ERIC SYSTEM CONTRACTORS."

for the

Teacher Education Council

School of Education

University of Massachusetts

Summer, 1976

SP011 772

ABSTRACT

This is a report of a Teacher Education Council (TEC), School of Education, University of Massachusetts study of 21 inservice programs, and 310 participants, currently enrolled for 1975-6. The research is designed to gain information from inservice enrollees on how well the programs are implementing the TEC inservice guidelines.

A 32 item questionnaire provides data concerning each of several guidelines, and several demographic issues.

The response sample was 33%, with a total of 101 returns. Responses from programs varied widely, from 11% to 100%. Several of the programs had a very small total enrollment.

For the total sample, participants generally rate programs quite highly on guideline items. There were a number of items that had many responses in the "don't know/doesn't apply" category.

A program comparison analysis of 12 programs (selected for size of responses) indicated marked differences among programs in the number of guideline items rated high or low. The small "n" for several programs requires caution in interpretation of this data.

Demographic data indicate a large number of inservice enrollees are working for degrees beyond the Masters. Their employment status is rather broadly spread across school roles. Motivations for involvement in inservice programs are largely in professional, enlarging work dimension, and degree seeking categories, as well as salary increases.

Detailed information on all questionnaire items, for the total sample and for the 12 programs, is available in the full Report. Implications and recommendations are also presented.

Inservice Program Implementation of

School of Education Guidelines, 1975-6 Enrollees

## INTRODUCTION

During the past three years, the School of Education at the University of Massachusetts has focused increasing attention on inservice teacher education (staff development). Starting with the vision provided by the Mason Bunker Report on Inservice Education (January 24, 1974, Report of the Inservice Study Committee), the Teacher Education Council (TEC) constructed guidelines for inservice, graduate level, program development and implementation. These guidelines (Table A) were approved through the governance procedures of the School of Education.

In the 1974-5 academic year, several new programs in addition to the few already in operation, were approved and started. By the 1975-6 academic year, about 21 programs were active, involving some 310 inservice participants. These programs were sponsored by a wide diversity of faculty and doctoral students, from the five Clusters of the School.

As one part of TEC's functions, this study reports on data concerning how well inservice programs are implementing the guidelines. Information is gathered through observations of inservice participants.

## THE GUIDELINES AND QUESTIONNAIRE

A thirty-two item questionnaire (Table B) was developed, aimed largely at gathering information about the following TEC inservice guidelines; relevant items are indicated:

a. a rationale for the program: including the goals; the relationship of goals to components used, such as learning experiences; learning theory(s): (Items #7, #8, #11, #12, #15, #16, #18, #23, #24, #25, #26).

b. involvement of participants (institutions and persons) in the development, implementation, and support of the program; on-site needs assessment: (Items #7, #8, #9, #10, #12, #13, #14, #17, #26, #27, #31).

c. attention to issues of institutional racism and sexism; relationship of education to social change; opportunities for those populations historically discriminated against: (Items #19, #20, #21, #29).

d. a description of program evaluation: #28.

e. attention to advising services: #22.

f. efforts to explore fresh approaches to inservice education: #30.

Not all of TEC's guidelines are referred to in the questionnaire, since it seemed unlikely that inservice participants would have relevant information. Examples are the guidelines that "the School of Education strives toward a leadership role in its major efforts", and "the School views the process of education as a conscious effort to influence".

Some items directly refer to a guideline, while others are probable indicators. Some items may provide clues to two interrelated guidelines.

Additional demographic items were designed to identify when the participant entered a program; whether academic credit was involved; whether and what level of degree was sought; the employment status; motivations for participant enrollment; and an open ended question on "most and/or least fruitful aspects of the program".

Most items have a scale attached, for example:

#7 This program helps to fulfill <u>your</u> personal goals.

| 1 ___ | 2 ___ | 3 ___ | 4 ___ | 5 ___ | 6 ___ |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| very poor | poor | fair | good | excellent | don't know or doesn't apply |

The questionnaire was constructed through several trial drafts, using the staff of TEC as one resource for ideas. Further ideas, and refinements, were supplied through the contributions of doctoral students in a seminar on inservice education.

## THE SAMPLE

The sample includes both programs and participants, for currently enrolled, 1975-6 academic year. A total of 310 questionnaires (with return addressed stamped envelopes) were mailed and delivered, during April, 1976. The responding sample was 101, which is a 33% return. These participants were in 21 inservice programs at the School of Education. In Table C data is provided on the number of participants in each program, the number who returned a completed questionnaire, and the percentage of returns.

## DATA ANALYSIS

Information from the questionraire is summarized on the basis of two types of samples: the total participants (n=101); and selected programs (n=12).

For the total sample, information is presented (Table B) for the 24 items with rating scales (items #7 through #30); this takes the form of means; and percentage of responses in two collapsed sections of the scales. (very poor, poor, and fair) and (good and excellent). Data is also presented of the percentage responding in the "don't know or doesn't apply" category. For the other demographic items frequency or percentage of responses is provided; i.e., items #2, #3, #4, #5, #31, #32.

For the analysis using programs as the sample, 12 programs are selected those with a response "n" of 4 or more; and two programs with "n" of 3 also included because they had a 100% response return. While an analysis of Chi square was made, the low "n" for several of the programs greatly reduces the meaning of the significant differences found among the programs. These results therefore will not be reported here. At this stage of the first year's study, we will aim more at getting a rough overview of program comparisons, by examining patterns of responses within programs, taking notice of "don't know or doesn't apply" responses, and noting differences in response returns among programs.

The possible influence of participant opinions, related to time of starting a program (item #2), is checked through an analysis using the "t" test.

## RESULTS

### Time of Enrollment Influence

The possibility of differences in response, between participants starting before the 1975-6 academic year (n=41) and during that year (n=60), was checked using a "t" test for each of the 24 items. There were only three items with significant differences (at .01 to .03 levels): #14 relating to program taking place off-campus; #17 concerning help from employing institution; and #19 relevant to institutional racism. For all three items, those starting during the 1975-6 academic year had higher means. Inspection of the program analysis indicates that these differences are largely due to responses in new programs

that did not exist prior to 1975-6. There does not appear to be any meaningful influence in participants responses that cuts across programs and that is a direct function of when participants enrolled.

Item Analysis: Total Sample

The overall finding for the total sample is that participants generally rate programs quite highly on almost all items (Table B). For the 24 items with rating scales (#7 through #30), all but one have a mean of 3.5 or higher. This mean is based on a scale range of 1= poor to 5= excellent, with 3= fair. For 18 of the items, the means are between 4.0 to 4.4. The lowest item is #12, referring to "utilization of preservice teachers as a help for inservice programs" (mean = 3.0).

This overall finding must be interpreted within the context of the number of participants who choose the "don't know/doesn't apply" response choice (Table B). For 13 of the 24 items, 10% or more made that choice; for 7 of the items, 20% to 46% made that response.

In Table B is presented the percentage of responses for the 24 items, using two collasped categories: (very poor, poor, and fair); and (good and excellent). This cut was made on the assumption that a rating of fair in this sort of questionnaire is probably only faint praise. Of the 24 items, 20 have ratings of 70% to 92% in the good-excellent category of responses; items #12, #13, #17, and #20 had low ratings of from 34% to 56%.

Demographic Data

Other information of a more demographic nature is provided in several items (Table B). More participants started during the 1975-6 academic year (n=60), then started prior to that time (n=41). Almost all are enrolled for academic credit (98%). None are working towards a Bachelors degree, while 51% are Masters, 31% are CAGS, 15% are Doctorate, and 4% are none of these.

Employment status responses gave 28 participants in secondary teaching, 24 in elementary teaching, 12 in administration, 7 in counseling, 6 in special education, 4 in pre-elementary, 3 in reading, 2 in media, and 1 each in several other areas.

The most significant reasons checked by respondents for being involved in an inservice program (item #31) were: professional career (n=87), personal development (86), academic degree (79), enlarge work dimensions (68), salary

increase (57), academic credit (55), school goals (48), change to different position (39), increased job responsibility (33), employer recognition (19), obtain certificate (17), peer recognition (12), and a scattering of responses for additional reasons.

A collation of the responses to the open ended question concerning most and least fruitful features of a program, resulted in the following as positives: personal responsibility to design own program (n=15); flexible program and variety (14); quality of staff (14); practical implementation of methods and theory (9); excellent counseling (9); on-site classes (8).

The negatives were: need to work more as a group (8); poor interconnections of program components (7); red tape (6); and a scattering of other comments.

Program Analysis

The 12 programs selected for analysis were chosen because they had enough responses to allow at least some indication of how individual programs were seen by participants. The "n" is very small for several programs, thus these results must be considered with much caution. These 12 programs include 81 participants of the 101 in the sample.

In Table D, the ratings for the 24 items on the guidelines are given for each program; and data is summarized for the demographic data on "starting of enrollment" and on "level of graduate degree".

By reading across, the pattern of responses for each program on all items can be seen. Reading down, the pattern of responses for each item, using all programs, can be observed.

A rough estimate of program strength as judged by participants using the 24 items is summarized in Table E. This presents a count, for each program, of the number of items that received 75% or more responses in the good to excellent part of the item scales; and the number of items that had 50% or more responses in the very poor to fair part of the item scales. This selection of what ratings constitute "high" and "low" is intentionally tipped towards increasing the standards, on the assumption that program staffs are not satisfied with only "fair" ratings.

Five programs have 20 or more items with at least 75% of the responses in the high category: Cooperative Education, Perspectives and Anisa with small numbers of respondents in the sample; Integrated Day and Teacher Corps with considerably larger number of respondents. These five programs have only from 0 to 3 items rated in the low category.

Three programs are rated rather low, with only 6 to 11 items in the high category, and with 5 to 11 in the low category. These are Part-Time Counseling, Amherst-Pelham Elementary Program (APEP), and Media Specialists; Part-Time Counseling has a sizable number of respondents; the other two have small "n's".

For the programs with small numbers of respondents, the use of the "don't know/doesn't apply" response can markedly affect whether an item is in the high or low ranking. For all the programs, for some items, a program might have a low rating because the item is not relevant to that program's intentions. A good example is item #11 "interaction with a preservice program".

Relating high and low ratings for each program by substracting the number of low rated items from the high rated number, provides another index shown in column "C" of Table E. Six programs have higher scores of from 17 to 24. There are four programs with lower scores of -1 to 9.

Three items (#12, #17, #20) have from 4 to 8 programs where 50-100 percent of ratings are in the low category.

## CONCLUSIONS

Several cautions should be noted concerning implications of this study of inservice programs. The sample is 33% of the total number of participants; and we do not know whether this is a representative sample. Some programs had considerably higher percentage of returns, but others have very low ones. Further, the total population for several programs is quite small. Also, a number of the programs have been in operation for only one year, and these may have had little time to address some of the TEC guidelines. It should be noted, too, that some of the items in the questionnaire refer to ideas or practices that a program intentionally does not include. With these reservations in mind, there are leads provided by the data that may be useful to the School of Education, TEC, and individual programs.

TEC guidelines are being carried out with a high level of success by the staff of most programs. This generalization is supported by the perceptions of the participants in the total sample, and by looking at the overall pattern of responses across the questionnaire items.

The total enrollment in each of the 21 inservice programs varies from 2 to 53; eleven programs have less than ten enrolled. There may need to be some attention given to finding ways that some programs can join with one

another, so as to increase the effective use of staff resources. There are six programs with an enrollment of 20 or more. One of these had a markedly high response return (Teacher Corps with 65%); the other five varied from 1% to 36% response returns.

The fact that nearly half (46%) of the sample are working towards a graduate degree beyond the Masters, may be a signal that the sample is not representative of the total; or it may also mean that several of the programs attract participants who already have their Masters. It is not clear from TEC guidelines whether this demographic data raises issues for consideration.

The range of employment roles of participants seems quite balanced among pre and elementary, secondary, specialists, and administrators.

The incentives for participating in programs are varied, suggesting that programs may expect a wide range of motivational attitudes among the inservice enrollees.

The rather large number of responses in some items in the "don't know/ doesn't apply" category, raises questions that cannot be answered without further information. Some of these questions can be pursued through changes in the questionnaire in a second year's study; some may be resolved through programs having been in existence for more than one year.

We will make only a few observations, in this first year study, concerning separate programs, due to the reservations noted above. For those programs with larger enrollments, it seems warranted to note that Teacher Corps had an unusually large number of enrollees responding, and had the highest positive assessment concerning the guidelines. Part-Time Counseling had a noticeably low assessment on several of the guidelines, and rated poorly in comparison to most other programs. Integrated Day and Boston English had a fairly consistent, high rating across most items. Boston English and Education for A Changing World had very low returns on the questionnaire, which may be an indication of the participants lack of support. Urban Education, with a fair response return, was rated on the guidelines somewhat low.

Among the smaller programs, those with a total enrollment of 8 to 19 may warrant comments. Cooperative Education, Reading, and APEP had an above average response return. Cooperative Education is quite highly rated by participants on the guidelines, while Reading is in the middle range of the program comparisons, and APEP is at the very low end. Perspectives, with a total enrollment of 5, had a 100% response and is rated quite highly.

For a second year's study of TEC's inservice programs, it will be useful to find additional ways to obtain a higher percentage of responses. The Council may also want to explore additional questions and select specific areas for fuller information.

TABLE A

9

## TEC INSERVICE GUIDELINES 1976-77

Every inservice program (or component) proposal should address the following guidelines:

1) Each proposal should include:

   a) a rationale for the program
   b) an explanation of the goals of the proposed inservice program which specifies participants, institutions involved, and the community it serves
   c) an explanation of how the various components of the inservice program are designed to reach the stated goals and their relationship to one another
   d) an explanation of the learning theory employed in the inservice program
   e) an explicit statement of the terms in which the program, the staff and the participants will be evaluated
   f) an explicit statement concerning:
      1. the duration of the program
      2. whether or not the program is degree granting
      3. whether or not credit if offered
      4. the extent to which the various constituents are involved (e.g., administrators, parents, etc.).
   g) an explicit statement of intention and design to study one or more variables in the process of teacher education
   h) an explanation of how the program is designed and operated consistent with a majority of the following TEC value statements:

      1. The School of Education strives toward a leadership role in its major efforts.
      2. The School of Education is committed to increasing the educational and life opportunities for individuals and groups who historically have not and presently do not have equal opportunity.
      3. The School of Education has a special obligation to improve education in the Commonwealth of Massachusetts.
      4. The School of Education values options for students and faculty.
      5. The School views the process of education as a conscious effort to influence.
      6. The School is committed to promoting more effective educational practices, critically reflecting upon existing educational practices, and developing alternative educational structures.

2) Each proposed program should include a description of an assessment of the needs and/or the desires of the community in which the cooperating institution is located.

3) A description of the provisions made for the staff of the cooperating institutions to participate in the identification of goals and areas to be explored during the inservice program, should be included.

4) Provisions made for the staffs of the cooperating institutions to share in the planning of the inservice program should be described.

5) A description of the site and nature of learning experiences should be included.

6) Proposals should include a description of the advising services to be offered.

7) Proposals should include a clear statement concerning the minimum budget (including assistantships) necessary to support the program for the life of the program and must also specify that resources are committed for the life of the program at a level sufficient to run all components.

8) Proposals should include a clear statement concerning enrollment limits and admission criteria. This should also define the "life span" and period of accountability for the program which would be at least the minimum time necessary for one group of students to complete all aspects of the program.

9) Proposals must define the specific training opportunities provided by the program for doctoral students.

10) Proposals must contain a clear statement describing the program's self-evaluation design.

TABLE B

## QUESTIONNAIRE FOR UMASS PARTICIPANTS IN INSERVICE PROGRAMS

### Data for Total Sample

Name _____ (All responses are confidential; names are used in event a second mailing is necessary to obtain maximum returns.)

1. What inservice program are you enrolled in at this University? (Circle the appropriate number.)

(1) Advocates for the Development of Human Potential (2) Bilingual Inservice (3) Career Development Program (4) Center for Urban Education Experienced Learners Inservice Program (5) Cooperative Education Graduate Program (6) Education for a Changing World (7) Education in Community Service (8) Eleven Plus Program (9) Inservice Consultant Resource Teacher Program (10) Inservice Degree Program for Instructional Leaders (11) Inservice Program Through a Collaborative Process (12) Inservice Implementation Based on the Anisa Model (13) Inservice Program for Audio-Visual Media Specialists (14) Inservice Reading Program (15) Integrated Day Inservice Growth Program (16) Mini-Sabbatical Program (17) Part-Time Master's Degree Program in Counselling (18) Perspectives in Interdisciplinary Education (19) Prescriptive Counselor Specialists (20) Professional Development in Higher Education (21) Boston English High School (22) Unified Science Education (23) Special Education Leadership (24) Other (Name) _____

2. Circle when you started in this program:

(1) Before the Fall of 1974 (15%) (2) Academic year of 1974-75 (26%)
(3) Academic year of 1975-76 (59%)

3. Is academic credit offered through this program? 1 98% yes 2 2% no

4. Are you working towards a degree through this program? 1 0 Bachelors 2 51% Masters 3 31% CAGS 4 15% Doctorate 5 4% None or Uncertain

5. Your employment situation: _____
(such as third grade teacher; secondary biology teacher; bilingual/bicultural supervisor; paraprofessional; not employed; etc.)

6. Name and address of institution, if you are employed:

_____

_____

_____

(continued over)

Please rate, for questions 7-30, the extent, degree, or quality of your inservice program. (Place a check next to the most appropriate number.) This Program:

| Mean | | 1 very poor or very little | 2 poor | 3 fair | 4 good | 5 excellent or very much | 6 don't know or doesn't apply |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 4.4 | *7. Helps to fulfill your personal goals. | | 8% | | 92% | | 2% |
| 4.2 | 8. Helps to carry out the expressed objectives of your employing institution. | | 13% | | 87% | | 11% |
| 3.9 | 9. Involves you in helping develop the program's overall design. | | 30% | | 70% | | 5% |
| 4.0 | 10. Involves you in helping implement the program's design. | | 25% | | 75% | | 10% |
| 3.9 | 11. Includes participation and interaction with one or more preservice program(s). | | 25% | | 75% | | 40% |
| 3.0 | 12. Utilizes preservice student teachers for such help as releasing time and energy for inservice program participation. | | 56% | | 44% | | 46% |
| 3.7 | 13. Uses a systematic approach to determine what the program objectives should be (such as a needs analysis). | | 36% | | 64% | | 21% |
| 4.3 | 14. Takes place in your employing institution and/or neighboring community. | | 19% | | 81% | | 18% |
| 4.3 | 15. Has learning experiences (courses, workshops, contracts, etc.) that help achieve program goals. | | 12% | | 88% | | 3% |
| 4.1 | 16. Has meaningful interrelationships among the learning experiences of the total program. | | 20% | | 80% | | 7% |
| 3.5 | 17. Has access to resources provided by your employing institution (time, staff, money, materials, etc.) to help with program operation. | | 45% | | 55% | | 21% |
| 4.1 | 18. Has an articulated explanation (rationale or theory) of its purposes and processes. | | 22% | | 78% | | 5% |

* Percentages for the two collapsed scales equal 100% of those who made a 1 to 5 rating response. Percentages in the "don't know" column are of the total of all responses to that item.

(continued next page)

| Mean | |
|---|---|
| 4.0 | 19. Explores the relevance of institutional racism to educational issues such as teaching and learning.<br>[ 1 _____ very poor or very little 2 27% poor 3 _____ fair ][ 4 73% good 5 _____ excellent or very much ] 6 24% don't know or doesn't apply |
| 3.8 | 20. Explores the relevance of institutional sexism to educational issues such as teaching and learning.<br>[ 1 _____ 2 34% 3 _____ ][ 4 66% 5 _____ ] 6 33% |
| 4.0 | 21. Explores the role of education to the study of social, economic, political improvements in the culture.<br>[ 1 _____ 2 26% 3 _____ ][ 4 74% 5 _____ ] 6 15% |
| 4.2 | 22. Provides support, personal help, and useful advice to you from the program staff.<br>[ 1 _____ 2 19% 3 _____ ][ 4 81% 5 _____ ] 6 2% |
| 4.0 | 23. Facilitates access to useful knowledge in relevant academic disciplines (subject matter facts and theories).<br>[ 1 _____ 2 21% 3 _____ ][ 4 79% 5 _____ ] 6 6% |
| 4.2 | 24. Facilitates access to useful knowledge about interpersonal interactions (between teachers and learners; among learners; among staff).<br>[ 1 _____ 2 20% 3 _____ ][ 4 80% 5 _____ ] 6 5% |
| 4.2 | 25. Facilitates access to useful knowledge about yourself (your attitudes, competencies, interests, goals, self-evaluation).<br>[ 1 _____ 2 20% 3 _____ ][ 4 80% 5 _____ ] 6 6% |
| 4.4 | 26. Has educational beliefs and processes that you agree with.<br>[ 1 _____ 2 9% 3 _____ ][ 4 91% 5 _____ ] 6 3% |
| 4.4 | 27. Provides opportunities for decision-making in setting your own goals and choosing your own methods of reaching goals.<br>[ 1 _____ 2 12% 3 _____ ][ 4 88% 5 _____ ] 6 3% |
| 4.0 | 28. Tries to carry out evaluations of program operations and outcomes.<br>[ 1 _____ 2 26% 3 _____ ][ 4 74% 5 _____ ] 6 10% |
| 4.1 | 29. Attempts to serve minority populations.<br>[ 1 _____ 2 19% 3 _____ ][ 4 81% 5 _____ ] 6 29% |
| 4.1 | 30. Explores more useful and powerful approaches to inservice education.<br>[ 1 _____ 2 25% 3 _____ ][ 4 75% 5 _____ ] 6 15% |

(continued over)

31. Please check any of the following incentives that are significant motivations for your involvement in this inservice program.

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| 87 | 1. Professional career | 68 | 10. Enlarge the dimensions of your work |
| 86 | 2. Personal development (other than career) | 33 | 11. Possible increase in job responsibilities |
| 55 | 3. Academic credit | 39 | 12. Possible change to different position |
| 79 | 4. Academic degree | 0 | 13. Renew certification |
| 57 | 5. Possible salary increase | 17 | 14. Obtain certification |
| 4 | 6. Direct cash stipend | 1 | 15. Enhance tenure decision |
| 12 | 7. Peer recognition | 5 | 16. Other |
| 19 | 8. Employer recognition | | |
| 48 | 9. Forwarding school goals | | |

OPEN ENDED QUESTION

32. Please list the features or ideas or approaches that you consider most and/or least fruitful in your inservice program:

Please return as soon as possible in the enclosed stamped, self-addressed envelope. We want to thank you for your professional help.

TABLE C

TOTAL ENROLLMENT AND RESPONSES BY PROGRAMS

| | Total Enrollment | Number of Returns | Percentage Returns |
|---|---|---|---|
| Bilingual Education | 7 | 1 | 14 |
| Career Development | 5 | 2 | 40 |
| Urban Education | 25 | 6 | 36 |
| Cooperative Education | 8 | 4 | 50 |
| Education for a Changing World | 27 | 3 | 11 |
| Education for Community Service | 2 | 1 | 50 |
| Eleven Plus | 2 | 1 | 50 |
| Consultant Resource Teacher | 4 | 1 | 25 |
| Program Through A Collaborative Process | 5 | 1 | 20 |
| Anisa | 3 | 3 | 100 |
| Media Specialists | 3 | 3 | 100 |
| Reading | 9 | 5 | 56 |
| Integrated Day | 36 | 11 | 31 |
| Part-Time Counseling | 39 | 12 | 30 |
| Perspectives | 5 | 5 | 100 |
| Higher Education | 13 | 3 | 23 |
| Boston English | 53 | 9 | 17 |
| Unified Science | 12 | 3 | 25 |
| Special Education | 16 | 4 | 25 |
| Teacher Corps | 20 | 13 | 65 |
| APEP | 16 | 6 | 38 |

TABLE D

LOW AND HIGH RESPONSE PERCENTAGES FOR ITEMS

| | n | (#7) L | H | N | (#8) L | H | N | (#9) L | H | N | (#10) L | H | N | (#11) L | H | N | (#12) L | H | N | (#13) L | H | N |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Urban Education | 6 | 17 | 83 | 6 | 33 | 67 | 6 | 34 | 66 | 6 | 50 | 50 | 6 | 25 | 75 | 4 | 75 | 25 | 4 | 40 | 60 | 5 |
| Cooperative Education | 4 | | 100 | 4 | | 100 | 4 | | 100 | 4 | 25 | 75 | 4 | | 100 | 2 | | 100 | 1 | 25 | 75 | 4 |
| Reading | 5 | | 100 | 5 | | 100 | 5 | 25 | 75 | 4 | 25 | 75 | 4 | 67 | 33 | 3 | 100 | | 2 | 40 | 60 | 5 |
| Integrated Day | 11 | | 100 | 11 | 9 | 91 | 11 | 9 | 91 | 11 | 18 | 82 | 11 | 10 | 90 | 10 | 38 | 62 | 8 | 50 | 50 | 8 |
| Part-Time Counseling | 12 | 8 | 92 | 12 | 13 | 87 | 8 | 82 | 18 | 11 | 78 | 22 | 9 | 80 | 20 | 5 | 100 | | 3 | 50 | 50 | 6 |
| Perspectives | 5 | | 100 | 5 | | 100 | 5 | 40 | 60 | 5 | | 100 | 5 | | 100 | 3 | 67 | 33 | 3 | | 100 | 3 |
| Boston English | 9 | 13 | 87 | 8 | 13 | 87 | 8 | 22 | 78 | 9 | | 100 | 9 | 20 | 80 | 5 | 75 | 25 | 8 | 38 | 62 | 8 |
| Special Education | 4 | 25 | 75 | 4 | | 100 | 4 | 25 | 75 | 4 | 25 | 75 | 4 | 50 | 50 | 2 | 50 | 50 | 2 | | 100 | 3 |
| Teacher Corps | 13 | | 100 | 13 | 16 | 84 | 13 | 8 | 92 | 13 | 15 | 85 | 13 | | 100 | 9 | 10 | 90 | 10 | | 100 | 12 |
| APEP | 6 | 34 | 67 | 6 | 20 | 80 | 5 | 17 | 83 | 6 | 17 | 83 | 6 | 20 | 80 | 5 | 40 | 60 | 5 | 60 | 20 | 5 |
| Anisa | 3 | | 100 | 3 | | 100 | 3 | | 100 | 2 | | 100 | 2 | | 100 | 2 | 100 | | 1 | | 100 | 3 |
| Media Specialists | 3 | | 100 | 3 | 33 | 66 | 3 | 33 | 67 | 3 | 50 | 50 | 2 | | 100 | 2 | | 100 | 1 | 33 | 67 | 3 |

* "L" includes very poor, poor, and fair responses; "H" includes good and excellent responses; "N" is number using the 1 to 5 rating response scale.

TABLE D (continued)

| | n | (#14) L | H | N | (#15) L | H | N | (#16) L | H | N | (#17) L | H | N | (#18) L | H | N | (#19) L | H | N | (#20) L | H | N |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Urban Education | 6 | 80 | 20 | 5 | 17 | 83 | 6 | | 83 | 6 | 60 | 40 | 5 | 17 | 83 | 6 | 17 | 83 | 6 | 33 | 67 | 6 |
| Cooperative Education | 4 | | 100 | 3 | | 100 | 4 | | 100 | 4 | 50 | 50 | 2 | 25 | 75 | 4 | | 100 | 4 | | 100 | 4 |
| Reading | 5 | | 100 | 3 | | 100 | 5 | | 100 | 4 | 50 | 50 | 4 | 40 | 60 | 5 | 40 | 60 | 5 | 40 | 60 | 5 |
| Integrated Day | 11 | 20 | 100 | 10 | | 100 | 11 | 20 | 80 | 10 | 60 | 40 | 10 | 10 | 90 | 10 | | 100 | 4 | | 100 | 5 |
| Part-Time Counseling | 12 | 50 | 50 | 8 | 18 | 82 | 11 | 22 | 78 | 9 | 60 | 40 | 5 | 10 | 90 | 10 | 50 | 50 | 10 | 50 | 50 | 10 |
| Perspectives | 5 | 25 | 75 | 4 | | 100 | 4 | 20 | 80 | 5 | 50 | 50 | 4 | | 100 | 5 | | 100 | 3 | | 100 | 4 |
| Boston English | 9 | | 100 | 8 | 22 | 78 | 9 | 22 | 78 | 9 | 13 | 87 | 8 | 25 | 75 | 8 | 25 | 75 | 8 | 38 | 62 | 8 |
| Special Education | 4 | | 100 | 3 | 25 | 75 | 4 | 25 | 75 | 4 | | 100 | 3 | | 100 | 4 | 33 | 67 | 3 | 67 | 33 | 3 |
| Teacher Corps | 13 | | 100 | 13 | | 100 | 13 | | 100 | 13 | 17 | 83 | 12 | | 100 | 13 | 8 | 92 | 12 | 10 | 90 | 10 |
| APEP | 6 | | 100 | 6 | 33 | 67 | 6 | 40 | 60 | 5 | 80 | 20 | 5 | 67 | 33 | 6 | 100 | | 2 | 100 | | 3 |
| Anisa | 3 | | 100 | 3 | | 100 | 3 | | 100 | 3 | | 100 | 2 | | 100 | 3 | | 100 | 3 | | 100 | 3 |
| Media Specialists | 3 | | 100 | 2 | | 100 | 3 | | 100 | 3 | 50 | 50 | 2 | 33 | 67 | 3 | 50 | 50 | 2 | 50 | 50 | 2 |

TABLE D (continued)

| | n | (#21) L | H | N | (#22) L | H | N | (#23) L | H | N | (#24) L | H | N | (#25) L | H | N | (#26) L | H | N | (#27) L | H | N |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Urban Education | 6 | 17 | 83 | 6 | 34 | 66 | 6 | 34 | 66 | 6 | 17 | 83 | 6 | 17 | 83 | 6 | 17 | 83 | 6 | 17 | 83 | 6 |
| Cooperative Education | 4 | | 100 | 4 | 25 | 75 | 4 | 25 | 75 | 4 | 25 | 75 | 4 | 25 | 75 | 4 | | 100 | 4 | | 100 | 4 |
| Reading | 5 | 40 | 60 | 5 | 20 | 80 | 5 | | 100 | 5 | 20 | 80 | 5 | 40 | 60 | 5 | | 100 | 5 | 40 | 60 | 5 |
| Integrated Day | 11 | 13 | 87 | 8 | 18 | 82 | 11 | 18 | 82 | 11 | 9 | 91 | 11 | 9 | 91 | 11 | | 100 | 11 | | 100 | 11 |
| Part-Time Counseling | 12 | 40 | 60 | 10 | 9 | 91 | 11 | 38 | 62 | 8 | 11 | 89 | 9 | 11 | 89 | 9 | 9 | 91 | 11 | 9 | 91 | 11 |
| Perspectives | 5 | | 100 | 5 | | 100 | 5 | | 100 | 5 | | 100 | 5 | | 100 | 5 | | 100 | 5 | | 100 | 5 |
| Boston English | 9 | 25 | 75 | 8 | 11 | 89 | 9 | 22 | 78 | 9 | 33 | 67 | 9 | 38 | 62 | 8 | 13 | 87 | 8 | 22 | 78 | 9 |
| Special Education | 4 | 25 | 75 | 4 | 25 | 75 | 4 | | 100 | 4 | 50 | 50 | 4 | 25 | 75 | 4 | | 100 | 4 | 25 | 75 | 4 |
| Teacher Corps | 13 | 18 | 82 | 11 | | 100 | 13 | 8 | 92 | 13 | | 100 | 13 | | 100 | 13 | | 100 | 13 | | 100 | 13 |
| APEP | 6 | 75 | 25 | 4 | 40 | 60 | 5 | 40 | 60 | 5 | 40 | 60 | 5 | 40 | 60 | 5 | 40 | 60 | 5 | 20 | 80 | 5 |
| Anisa | 3 | | 100 | 3 | 33 | 67 | 3 | | 100 | 3 | | 100 | 3 | | 100 | 3 | | 100 | 3 | | 100 | 3 |
| Media Specialists | 3 | 50 | 50 | 2 | | 100 | 3 | | 100 | 3 | 33 | 67 | 3 | 33 | 67 | 3 | | 100 | 3 | 33 | 67 | 3 |

TABLE D (continued)

| | n | (#28) L | H | N | (#29) L | H | N | (#30) L | H | N | (#2) A | B** | (#4) M | C | D | No |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Urban Education | 6 | 17 | 83 | 6 | 17 | 83 | 6 | 33 | 67 | 6 | 5 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 1 |
| Cooperative Education | 4 | | 100 | 4 | | 100 | 3 | | 100 | 4 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 1 | | |
| Reading | 5 | 20 | 80 | 5 | 20 | 80 | 5 | 40 | 60 | 5 | 3 | 2 | 2 | 3 | | |
| Integrated Day | 11 | 27 | 73 | 11 | 20 | 80 | 5 | 27 | 73 | 11 | 9 | 2 | 7 | 3 | 1 | |
| Part-Time Counseling | 12 | 40 | 60 | 10 | 29 | 71 | 7 | 60 | 40 | 5 | 10 | 2 | 12 | | | |
| Perspectives | 5 | | 100 | 4 | 25 | 75 | 4 | | 100 | 5 | 1 | 4 | 2 | 2 | 1 | |
| Boston English | 9 | | 100 | 9 | | 100 | 8 | 22 | 78 | 9 | | 9 | 1 | 1 | 6 | 1 |
| Special Education | 4 | 50 | 50 | 4 | 67 | 33 | 3 | | 100 | 3 | 1 | 3 | 1 | | 3 | |
| Teacher Corps | 13 | | 100 | 12 | 10 | 90 | 10 | | 100 | 13 | | 13 | 2 | 9 | | 2 |
| APEP | 6 | 60 | 40 | 5 | 50 | 50 | 2 | 80 | 20 | 5 | 1 | 3 | 3 | 2 | 1 | |
| Anisa | 3 | 33 | 67 | 3 | | 100 | 3 | | 100 | 3 | 1 | 2 | 2 | | 1 | |
| Media Specialists | 3 | 50 | 50 | 2 | | 100 | 2 | | 100 | 3 | | 3 | 1 | 2 | | |

** Column "A" is n enrolled prior to 1975-6; "B" is during 1975-6.

Column "M" is n working towards Masters; "C" is n towards CAGS; "D" is n towards Doctorate; "No" is no degree.

TABLE E

SUMMARY OF LOW AND HIGH ITEM RATINGS FOR PROGRAMS

| | N | L* Very poor, poor, and fair 50%+ | H Good and excellent 75%+ | H-L |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Urban Education | 6 | 4 | 13 | 9 |
| Cooperative Education | 4 | 1 | 23 | 22 |
| Reading | 5 | 2 | 13 | 11 |
| Integrated Day | 11 | 3 | 20 | 17 |
| Part-Time Counseling | 12 | 11 | 11 | 0 |
| Perspectives | 5 | 2 | 21 | 19 |
| Boston English | 9 | 1 | 19 | 18 |
| Special Education | 4 | 6 | 17 | 11 |
| Teacher Corps | 13 | 0 | 24 | 24 |
| APEP | 6 | 7 | 6 | -1 |
| Anisa | 3 | 0 | 22 | 22 |
| Media Specialists | 3 | 5 | 11 | 6 |

* Column "L" is the number of items with responses of 50% or more in the lower part of the rating scales; "H" is responses of 75% or more in the higher part of the scales; data from Table D.